

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| JOHN M. PIERCE, | § | |
| Interpleader Plaintiff/Stakeholder, | § | |
| vs. | § | Civil Action No. 3:21-CV-2770-S-BH |
| | § | |
| MILOS FUND LLC, a Nevada limited | § | |
| liability company, et al., | § | |
| Interpleader Defendants/Claimants. | § | Referred to U.S. Magistrate Judge ¹ |

ORDER

On November 9, 2021, the *pro se* plaintiff filed a complaint against the defendants and paid the filing fee. (*See* doc. 3.) Because he paid the fee, the plaintiff is now responsible for serving each defendant with a summons and a copy of the complaint in this case as provided by Rule 4(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the filing of the complaint, the action is subject to dismissal against that defendant without prejudice. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). In addition, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(l)(1) requires the plaintiff to file proof of service with the Court unless service is waived. This proof must consist of “the server’s affidavit” if service was not accomplished by the United States Marshal or a deputy marshal. *Id.* If the plaintiff does not file a valid return of service or otherwise show that a defendant was properly served, this action may be dismissed against that defendant.

To the extent that she has not already done so, the Clerk of the Court shall send summons forms and a copy of Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 to the plaintiff.

SO ORDERED this 12th day of November, 2021.


IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹By *Special Order 3-251*, this *pro se* case has been automatically referred for full case management.